

2732
A
VINDICATION
And ^{2/}
DEFENCE
Of *Mr.* George Meldrum's
SERMON,

Preached May 16. 1703.

Against the REFLECTIONS, and CENSURES
Of the *Author* of the EXAMINATION
of Some Things in the SERMON,
and the *Author* of TOLE-
RATION Defended:

*Psalm 56. 5. Every Day they Wrest my Words, all their thoughts
are against me for Evil.*

EDINBURGH,

Printed in the Year, 1703.

AMERICAN DEFENDING GEORGE MASON

President, 1800
 Against the REFLECTIONS
 Of the late of the
 and the nation of
 HATHORN Defendant

Printed at the Press of
 and sold by the



Printed in the Year 1793

Courteous Reader,

I Have such a Love to Peace and Concord, to Love and Unity in the Truth, that all Strife and Division, yea Contentious Disputing and Debating is unpleasant to me; But Experience shews the beginning of Strife is like the letting out of Waters, and there is no end of Writing and Printing. The Debates of late, anent the Toleration desired, for these of the Episcopal way, hath I think, either wid'ned the Difference, or discovered it to have been greater than I apprehended it to be, some having to justify their Separation, advanced Positions, not known or owned in this Church before: And do not only divide in practice, but to justify themselves therein, disseminat Principles destructive to the Truth and Being not only of this, but of most of the Reformed Churches. New Doubts are moved, and Stumbling-blocks cast before the People. We thought the Difference had been only anent Church-Government; but now it's Represented to be, not only anent that, but Errors in Doctrine are Charged on our *Confession of Faith*, and Pollutions on our Worship, and such a Necessity of Episcopal Ordination is urged as nullifies the Ministry, and all the Ordinances dispensed, by such who want it.

This is done particularly by two, to wit, the *Author* of the *Examination*, &c; And that of *Toleration Defended*, who have attacked a part of my SERMON, Preached May 16. where I thought myself most safe and secure.

Should I design only the Vindication of my Sermon, that might be easily performed, it being so manifest, that they either Mistake or Wrest my Words, but because some have thought it fit that some Animadversions should be made upon them, I have given them, notwithstanding of my aversion from Debates.

As for the *Author* of the *Examination*, &c, he is pleased to say,

that all that seems Material against the *Tol.* desired, in the Sermon he takes to be fully Answered, in the Case of the Episcopal Clergy, &c. two things only excepted, them therefore he sayeth he shall only consider: I shall therefore refer him to the Answer of the Case, or Remarks upon it, and follow him in his Consideration of these two Particulars, which he culleth out of some few Lines of the 14 page of the Sermon, which he thus sets down, page third of the Exam.

One is (sayeth the Examin.) *That he knows no Episcopal Minister who judges Communion with the Presbyterians, (my Words are, Communion with us in Worship) unlawful, unless there be any of them, who assert such a Necessity of Episcopal Ordination, as nullifies the Ministry, and all the Ordinances dispensed by such who want it. The other, that such an Opinion should not be Tolerat in any Protestant Church. My Words were, And that I confess is, such an Opinion, that I think should not be Tolerat in any Protestant Church, being Destructive to the Truth, and Beeing of the most of Protestant Churches.*

As to the first of these, it might suffice to say, that in his Consideration thereof, page 3. He either mistakes or misrepresents, as if I had said, *There can be no solid Reason to hold Communion with such Churches, the Ordinations of whose Clergy are unquestionable.* Whereas I neither thought, nor spoke so, nor do my Words bear any such Sense. Yea page 4. he confesseth it, tho he spake diminutively, that I seem page 12. of the Sermon, to grant, *that Men may justly refuse to hold Communion with Churches which require sinful Terms of Communion.* &c. And then adds, *whether he grant it or not, it's received Truth.* It is not fairely done to speak doubtfully, as if he would leave a Suspicion in the minds of Readers anent my Judgement, when it was so clearly delivered page 12, of the Sermon; And therefore, all his first Six pages are to no purpose, as to the first Proposition.

But it seemeth he designed to give some Reasons to justify their Separation, and therefore page 4 and 5, he sets down three or 4. Cases of sinful Terms of Communion, and then makes Application of them, for justifying their Separation; and for that he might also referred to other Papers, they have printed for that end, where these are more largely prosecuted, and then I should referred him to their Answers, But seeing he proposeth them, as considerations of a Position

sition of my Sermon, though they belong not to that, and to use
 his own words page 7. you may judge, if it was after accurate think-
 ing on that first Position that he wrote this; yet seeing as I said,
 he proposeth them as considerations of a position of my Sermon, I
 shall take a brief review of them. But shall first freely acknow-
 ledge, that though I said in my Sermon page 14. that I did know
 no Minister of that way, who judge Communion with us in Wor-
 ship unlawful, unless these be any of them, who assert such a ne-
 cessity of Episcopal Ordination, &c. yet I find now that which I
 did not know then. 1. That there are some of them, who plead
 Communion with us, unlawful on other Grounds. And 2. That
 some Question our Ordination, though I ingenuously declare, that
 tho I be now above sixty Years of Age, I did never in all my Life
 before, hear any of this Church or Nation, advance such a Position,
 or assert such a Necessity of Episcopal Ordination, but on the con-
 trary, these even of the Episcopal perswasion, of my Acquaintance,
 did reject it with averlation, therefore I spoke so doubtfully (*un-
 less there be any, who assert such a Necessity, &c.*) and I hope there
 are but few who do it yet, unless it be some *hotter spirits*, to use the
 words of our Learned Countrey Man, the Bishop of Sarum in page
 259. of his Exposition of the 39 Articles of the Church of England.
 But let us consider the Cases he proposeth of sinfull Communion,
 and his Application of them.

The first is page 4. *Subscription (sayeth he) to Erroneous Propositions
 is a sinful Term of Communion.* I grant it is so. But then he Erreth
 in his Application, for the Question is about Communion with us in
 Worship, and these were my expresse Words. Now Subscription is
 not the Term of Communion in Worship.

And while in the same page 4. he sayeth they are perswaded,
 there are some very Erroneous Propositions in that Confession: this
 is a bold accusation without any Instance, or proof of the Errour.
 Humility, charity, and discretion, would have obliged to have re-
 presented this, more privately, or to some Church Judicatory, and
 humbly Instanced the particulars, before such an open accusation of
 the confession, and Reflection not only on the Church, but on the
 Supreme Authority, and Law of the Nation, Ratifying it. And
 yet the Accusation is general without any particular Instanced.

I add, that tho there were some errors in the Confession of a Church, that were no sufficient ground of Separation from Worship, when Subscription and Assent thereto, is not required, far less if the Propositions be but *dubious*, which is the second Case he mentioneth also without Instance and Ground: As he hath without proof insinuate. *That there are in our Confession diverse Propositions which plainly cross Propositions contained in the Confession of the Faith of our Reformers anno 1560, sworn to by most of the Episcopal Clergy in the Test.*

The 2d. Case is *Subscriptions to Propositions very dubious*, which he seemeth to expone by what followeth. *To Propositions which have been much opposed by Grave, Holy, Learned and Orthodox Men, with very plausible Arguments; All that he saith of this is, That it is not hastily to be granted. Such Propositions are not rashly to be subscribed to. And I readily grant we should in no such thing be rash and hasty; But what doth this concern Communion in Worship? where no such Subscription is required.*

The 3d. Case he mentioneth in which it is unlawful to hold Communion with a Church, *page 4. and applyeth page 5. is the case of pollutions in a Churches Worship.* But in the Application, he hath not the confidence to instance any thing in our Worship, which polluteth the Soul of any who joyneth with us in Worship, and we confidently deny the Charge, and though we acknowledge Imperfections and Defects, both in our Persons and Worship, yet we deny that there is any thing in our Worship, the use of which defileth them who joyn with us in Worship.

He saith *page 5. It is not without ground they are scrupulous to joyn with us in our Worship.* He hath not confidence to say, there are pollutions in our Worship, which would defile them, but that they are scrupulous about it, and not without Ground. Now I hope he will not say, that every one who hath a Scruple, should have a publick Toleration by Law. But what are the Grounds they have to be scrupulous to joyn with us? I see none, only he propoundeth some Questions, which insinuate Accusations against us, tho they will not all infer his Conclusion. Why 1. he asks, *have they not sent a packing, the publick reading of the Scriptures?* Answer, Not, We have not, for though we allow not the Precentor to read, yet we appoint Ministers to read the Scriptures publickly, and they do both read and expound. Nor

Nor have we forbidden the use of the Lords Prayer, though perhaps some think it too commonly omitted. Nor know I any prohibition of the Use of the Creed. But will he say that the omission of that, or of singing the *Doxology* in Metre at the end of Psalms, is a sufficient Ground of Separation? we do ordinarily give Glory to GOD, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, expressly in the close of our Prayers; And will he separate because we do not sing it in Metre, at the end of Psalms?

But after this p. 5. l. 25. to 28. he addeth a grievous Charge; *Besides* (saith he) *in their publick Prayers, those of the Episcopal Perswasion, think there are more than one or two unfavoury petitions, petitions whereby GOD is dishonoured, by consequence petitions they cannot bear without horror, they cannot say Amen to, with a good Conscience, without polluting their own Souls.* Here a fearful Accusation, which as delivered accuseth all, as if we had one common Liturgy: I pray GOD forgive him. But I hope first he will not have the confidence to say so of all, and every one.

2. Hath he heard such petitions, and by himself or some other admonished of it. 3. Though it were true, that some one or other, had at some time unfavoury petitions, (which we deny till he prove it) yet is this sufficient ground of separation? Is a Hearer guilty of all the personal, yea, or of all the Ministerial Defects of a Minister, whether in Preaching or Praying? What Church or Divine, would justifie such a Separation.

That which others object anent Baptism and the Lord's Supper, are sufficiently answered by the Gentleman's Letter, and the Remarks on the Case; And therefore, seeing our Author doth not mention them, I pass them also, and proceed to that which he mentioneth page 5. as his fourth Case and Ground of refusing Communion, which he prosecuteth page 6. and part of the 7th.

And this his fourth Ground, on which it may be unlawful to hold Communion with a Church, *Even while her Faith is sound, and her Worship unpolluted, is, when she is Schismatical.* This is (saith he) *always the case of all Churches, that are purely Schismatical.* And p. 6. he giveth this Reason for it, *That Schismaticks by being such, are cut off from the only Salutory Communion, the One Communion of the One visible Body of Christ.* And then applys it to the Presbyterian Church in Scotland, of

of which he saith, *That suppose her Faith were as sound, and her Worship as pure as her self can wish them, et these of the Episcopal Perswasion, have too good reason to judge their Communion unlawful, if she is (as they are perswaded she is) Schismatical.* And so according to this Man's great Charity, the Presbyterian Church in Scotland, is cut off from the only Salutary Communion, the One Communion of the One visible Body of Christ: Would there not need clear proof for so bold, so severe and uncharitable a Censure, of a whole Church? And yet he giveth none at all, but bids me purge our Communion on true Church Principles.

For Answer, The Author would remember, the Presbyterians wont and do charge the Prelatical party in Scotland as Schismatics, and may I not say with as good ground purge your Communion of Schism. But 2. It were enough for me to deny the charge, he who affirmeth it should prove it. Were it just or fair dealing for one to accuse another of Adultery, or Theft, &c. And then all the proof he brings, is, ye must prove your self Chaste and Honest.

But I shall take further Review of his Principle, and show the groundlessness of his Application, and falshood of his Charge against us.

And 1. Seing Schism hath various acceptions, and there are diverse kinds of it, our Author should have given us a description of Schism, and told us what kind of Schism he chargeth us with. The Author of the *Toleration Defended*, hath the confidence to say, page 1. *That neither the Author of the Letter, nor any of the Party for whom he appears, durst ever state a true notion of Schism, or give such a definition of it, as is sufficient to vindicate the Reformation without blackning the whole Presbyterian party with the dangerous guilt of that damning sin.* But this is like others of this Mans bold but false Accusations: As diverse of that way writing on that Subject, have stated the true notion of Schism (so the Author of the Letter could easily do it if he would) so as to vindicate the Reformation, and not to blacken themselves. And tho I should not much contend with this Author of *Toleration Defended*, anent the description he gives of Schism page 1 and 2. *That we are to understand thereby every willful Separation from, or desertion of the Communion of any part of the Catholick Church, where the Terms of Communion are not sinful:* Yet I cannot agree to his description of a Church, page 2. *That the name of a Church, must always be understood*
of

of a Society of Christians, unite by Communion under their lawful Pastors, canonically ordained, by an uninterrupted succession from the Apostles. For I cannot yield, that either Canonical Ordination, (according to Church Canons) or uninterrupted Succession, are necessary to the being of a Church, so that, if the Ordination be not according to the Canons of the Church, and that in continual Succession from the Apostles, there is no Ministry, nor Church, but in this matter as also in the Accusation of Schism, our Author takes the same way as the Papists do, against Reformed Churches, both in Accusing and Arguing, as may be seen in *Jansenius* his Debate with *Voetius* on this Subject.

But perhaps, for the clearer discuss of this Question, anent Schism, it will not be unfit to take notice of the signification of the Word *Schism*, and find out the various acceptations, kinds or ways thereof.

As to the first, schism, *ἑξίς* is a Greek word, which signifies Division, or Rent, where there was Unity before, and by its use the Church is restrained to Dissentions, and Divisions about matters of Religion. And according as the cause is just, so the Separation is justifiable, *Revel. 18. 4.* But *Schism* is usually taken in the worst sense, for that which is unwarrantable, and as it is contradistinguished to Heresy, its a dissolution, or breach, of that Union, that ought to be amongst Christians, consenting together in the same Faith, and this is either in the Church, *1 Cor. 1. & 10. 11. Chap. 3. beg.* or from it *Heb. 10. 25, 26.* And that either from the Catholick Church or from a particular, negative or positive, see *Cameron, de schismate*, rash, and on light occasion, or an unjust occasion, in whole or in part, see also *Amesius, Cas. de schis. pag. 307.* Where there is a rejecting of all Communion; or partiall, so farr as Communion cannot be kept without Sin, thus it may be either from Worship, or but in Government only, so that ye may see that *Schism* is a breaking of Commanded Union, or of that Church Union which is of Gods making. And because this breach of Union doth chiefly appear, in denying, or refusing Communion with the Church, in the use of Gods publick Worship and Ordinances, therefore that kind of Separation is by a kind of singular appropriation, truly and rightly, and most commonly called Schism, this much may serve for open-

ing the nature of Schism, whereby it may be easily manifested, that both Reformed Churches are free of any guilt, in their Separation from the Romish Church, and the Presbyterians from any guilt of Schism imputable to them. I hope the Author will not question the first, and our Divines have often demonstrated it, that our Ancestors had just and necessary causes to separate from the Church of Rome, and could not continue therein without sin against God, and thus vindicated themselves from the Romish Charge of Schism, which yet on all occasions they repeat.

It is easie also to shew, that the Presbyterians of this Nation, cannot at this time, be justly charged with the guilt of Schism of any kind, sure not from the Catholick Church, while they profess with them, *one Lord, one Faith, and one Baptism, and love to all them, who profess Faith in, and love to the Lord Jesus Christ, and live accordingly.*

We have also a love and respect to all the Churches of Christ, even these who are distant from us, and with whom we have no occasion of local communion in Worship, and have communion with them, *in the same substantials of Doctrine, and Worship, Word and Sacraments.* Nor do we deny those to be Churches of Christ, with whom we cannot have actual Communion in Worship, because we conceive we cannot do it without sin.

And it is not we, but our Brethren, who divide and separate from publick Assemblies for Worship in this Land, and Church, and so not we, but they are guilty of this Schism, or Division and causeless separation in Worship, I wish our Brethren would consider the Words of our Learned Countrey Man, Dr. Burnet (which should be the more heeded by them, that he is a Bishop, Bishop of Sarum, who in his fourth Discourse to his Clergy, concerning the obligations to continue in the Communion of the Church, in the beginning of that discourse, which is pag. 265. of the Book, proposeth to discourse of our obligations to continue in the Communion of that Church in which we were born, which he describes to be the main body of that Society of Christians among whom we live. and asserts, that there is nothing that more concerns the peace and order of Churches, And indeed the quiet and good Government of mankind, than rightly to understand our obligations thereto, the extremes being dangerous on both hands, and page 266. he sayeth, the foundation to be laid here is, First. To consider the natural obligation, that

that all men who are united by any common Bond, come under to maintain a cordial affection, and a mutual good understanding, among themselves. --- And pag. 267. as this consideration is common to all joint bodies of men, its much stronger in the Christian Religion, one of its main designs being to knit mens hearts to one another, by a tenderness of Brotherly kindness, and charity, and pag. 268. this being a main part of the Glory, as well as of the Duties of our Religion. To Advance this, and to indue us one to another, we are obliged to pray with and for one another, we are bound to assemble our selves together, that by our seeing of one another, and meeting in the same Acts and Duties of Religion, our love and union may become stronger, and more firmly cemented. And pag. 269. That the chief mean of doing this is their uniting themselves in the same Acts of worship.

Its a notable saying of the pious and moderat Mr. Corbet of the Kingdom of God, pag. 70. Tho to meet in one place, be not of so great Importance as to be joynd in one Spirit, yet it must not be counted a small matter. The Unity of Faith and Love is much concerned in the Unity of Church Communion; it will be a matter of some difficulty for them to live together in love, whom one Church cannot hold. Church divisions commonly divides affections, and draw men unto parties, and divided Interests & makes them seek to strengthen their own party, by weakning all others, to the great damage of true Religion in general.

And to return to Dr. Barnes speaking of uniting in the same Acts of Worship. He sayeth, pag. 269. The only Question that will main, will be how far must this go? And the only Answer that can be made to it, is, that it must go, till the body, in which we happen to be engaged, imposes unlawful terms of Communion on its Members. Now, let all Men, yea, let the Consciences of our Brethren judge, whether at this day, they, or we separat from the Body of the Christians, among whom we live, in their publick Assemblies for Worship, while as yet there are no full Terms of Communion Imposed on the Members of that Body.

And it will be no sufficient Vindication of our Brethren at this time, to use a Retorsion, concerning the withdrawing of some of the Presbyterians, from their Worship, in the time of Prelacy, for

which they pleaded their own Reasons. But I will not digress to inquire into them, nor to justify or condemn their practise, if our Brethren think they did wrong, they should not imitate them therein. But seeing it is undeniable, that it is they, who separat, and divide, and plead for division in Worship, and Assemblings for it, when no sinfull Terms of Communion therein are Imposed on them, they, and not we are the Dividers and Schismatics in point of Worship now. But as for us we know no Worshipping Assembly, to which once we were united, and from which we separat, and divide, and therefore cannot in this be charged with Schism.

And to conclude this Debate anent Schism, as we do deny the generall Charge of Schism, as most Injurious, so we cannot Imagine any Semblance of breach of Union in the Church, with which they can charge us, unless it be, that of *Union, or subjection rather to the Prelats*, which we are perswaded is not of Gods making. And tho the Author of the Exam. doth pag. 12. with his usual confidence assert, *all the Presbyterians within the Kingdom are bound to own, and submit to the Bishops, as their lawful Ecclesiastical Superiours*, we do confidently deny it. The Prelats were never our *lawful Ecclesiastical Superiours*, but Usurpers over us, not only without warrand from the Scripture, but imposed by Civil Authority, without the choise and consent of this National Church, by vertue of the Claim of Supremacy, and Sovereign Authority of the King, and seeing it had no other Foundation, or Right by its last Settlement in this Church, but an Act of Parliament, and no Church Constitution, it can be no Church Schism, nor contrary to any Statute, Canon or Law of Church or State. And Prelacy being by Supream Authority of the Nation abolished, they can then on no account be called our lawful Ecclesiastical Superiours, our disowning of them can be on no account charged upon us as Schism, or breach of that Union which ought to be in this Church. And if our disowning the Bishops be a Schism, then I may say of it, as Gerard said of separation from Rome, it is a good Schism, a blessed Schism.

Its also worthy of Consideration, that seeing every Schism is not of the same kind, nor upon like weighty accounts. It may be found on due Consideration, that every kind of Schism where

of a Church or Body of Christians, may be guilty, is no sufficient Reason to refuse all Communion with them in Worship. We ought not indeed to joyn with any in their Schism, or in any sin, but there may be lawful joyning in Worship, where the Pastor or People may be under some guilt of Schism; You read of Schisms in the Church of *Corinth*, *1 Cor. chap. 1. ver. 10, 11, 12.* And was it unlawful for such to joyn in worship together? And if the difference and division be only anent Church Government, there will need clear proof to convince that it were unlawful to joyn in Worship, for this they may do without participation of the Schism: When Christians who consent in the Faith assemble together for publick Worship, they do not profess themselves to be Episcopal, or Presbyterian, or Independent, but to be Christians and profess the Faith of Christ.

Yea, and the Historians of the Church tells us the Orthodox in time of persecution, united with the *Novatians* in Worship, and the *Donatists* united by Fraternal Accommodation, and not by Subjection.

It is commonly granted each error in a Church doth not make Communion with it unlawful, and why should every defect, in Love and Peace, every Division and Schism, make Communion unlawful? If it do, either it must be because thereby it ceaseth to be a true Church, or that Communion with that Church so Schismatical, doth involve in the guilt of Schism; Not the first, for the Author grants such to be Churches, and that they may have valid Ordinations: Not the second, for Communion with them in these Duties and Ordinances wherein they agree doth not imply, nor signifie their Approbation of that wherein they differ, and for which they blameably divide from others.

And thus I hope I have vindicated our Communion from Schism by true Church Principles, and not argued merely from this, that it hath Civil Law for it.

And now I think I may appeal to any unbyassed Reader, yea, to the Authors own Conscience, if it be just or charitable for him to say, of Schismatics in general without any caution, exception, or limitation, as *pag. 6. Exam. Schismatics by being such, are cut from the only salutary Communion, the one Communion of the one visible body of Christ*

Christ, — And then in the Application, tells the present Presbyterian Church in Scotland is Schismatical, and so in his judgement cut off from all salutary Communion. *Or* and that as he expounds it, p. 12. *Because we submit not to the Bishops as our lawful Ecclesiastical Superiors*, and if ye will believe Mr. Dodwel one Altar, page 358. *Disunion from the Bishop is disunion from Christ and the Father*, and page, 360. *Such have no Interest in the Prayers and Intercession of Christ*. Is not this very like the Popish Tenets, *That it is de necessitate salutis, &c. That it is of necessity to Salvation to be subject to the Bishop of Rome*. And in our Author and Mr. Dodwels Language, *It is of necessity to Salvation to all within the Diocese of Edinburgh, to be subject to the Bishop of Edinburgh*.

And if they will speak it plainly, whatever other Reasons are pretended, this is the grand Reason, why they will have no Communion with us, because we acknowledge not Subjection to the Prelats. And if we must stand and fall at their Judgement, we are not Christians, we are not in that case capable of Pardon or Salvation. Surely this is an uncharitable and schismatical principle, without any shadow of Proof, from Scripture or Reason.

When Men set Terms of Communion with GOD, and Eternal Salvation, they should have sure and clear Grounds from Scripture, and yet I am sure there is not so very erroneous a Proposition in all the Confession, our Author instanceth, as this, and it is but a very modest expression, to say, there is not so dubious a proposition in all our Confession as this, if we may judge by our Authors Rule, *Having been much opposed, not only by Grave, Holy, Learned, and Orthodox Men, but by many whole Churches*: And thus we may see, who are the chief Pleaders for Toleration, and what a Toleration they plead for. They are such who think we are not Christians without GOD, and without Christ, and without hope of Pardon, Mercy, or Salvation, while we are not Subject to the Prelats. And who refuse Communion with us on that account: But let us submit to the Bishops, and their allowance will make Ministers, good valid Ministers, and the People good Christians, in a state of Salutary Communion. For our Author tells us, page 14. *The Bishops allowance is equivalent to Episcopal Ordination*: And why not to Baptism and Chriftening? And they must be tolerated to disseminate these Principles.

I Remem-

I remember I did in the close of my Sermon, page 14. offer in a passing way this Cautionary Advice to Episcopal Ministers ahent Separation from the publick worship, that they would remember how they blamed some of the Presbyterian Way, for withdrawing from them in publick worship, and would beware to imitate them in what they do condemn. Now the Author of the *Toleration Defended*, doth spend the whole 23, and part of the 24 page of his Pamphlet, in railing or Rallery on this, and me, for my want of Logick, after he hath put the Argument, which he calls mine, in the best form (as he saith) he can. Thus whatsoever Episcopals did condemn in others, that they ought not to do themselves, but Episcopals did condemn Presbyterians for withdrawing from the Episcopal Communion, and setting up their own Schismatical Conventicles: *Ergo* the Episcopals ought to withdraw from Episcopal Communion, and turn Presbyterian. And then crys out, Is not this a strange Argument, and above, a rare Argument indeed, and saith, if this Argument had been proposed by an Episcopal Minister, he would readily have granted, that he deserved, for want of Logick, to be reckoned amongst their ignorant Clergy: But from the mouth of one of their Presbyterian Professors of Theology, and a Preacher of a very long standing, it's even as good an Argument amongst them as ever *Aristotle* made in his Life. And then represents it as a Sophism, a Lye and a Falshood, sanctified from the Pulpit and Chair of Verity.

I shall leave the Reader to Judge, whether seing the Syllogism is of his own forming, and not mine, the Censure doth not return on his own head. And to say no worse, he either wants Logick or Ingenuity, for neither the Assumption nor Conclusion is mine.

But if he desire to have the Argument in form, it might be thus. Episcopal Ministers should not imitate the Presbyterians in that for which they did condemn them. But Episcopal Ministers did condemn Presbyterians for separating from publick worship in the Congregations where they lived, because of the difference in Church Government; *Ergo*, The Episcopal Ministers should not imitate them, in withdrawing from publick worship in the Congregations where they live, because of the difference in Church Government. But leaving this Author, who hath more of Railing than Reason,

I shall

I shall take notice of what the Author of the Examination sayeth anent this *pag.* 14. & 15. Where he reckoneth this expression up as my 5. Argument, for my 2d. Position. And that which he sayeth, consists much in an *encomium* of what the Episcopal Church then was, whose Communion was, sayeth he, not only lawfull, but desirable, and he sayeth, they condemned, and do condemn the Presbyterian Schism. And he may know that the Presbyterians did then also charge the Episcopal party with Schism. He sayeth, they blamed them, for separating from a Church which had unquestionable Orders, &c. But the Presbyterians did not only question the Episcopal Order, but think they did it on better ground, than the Episcopalians question their Orders, he sayeth, they who are of the true Episcopal principles are where they were, before the Presbyterians left them, I wish this Author would tel us what are these true Episcopal principles? For I am sure these were not their Principles in the year 62. & 88. If these be the terms, he referreth to, that Episcopal Ordination, was of such necessity, as the want of it nullifies the Ministry of, and all the Ordinances dispensed by these who have it not.

I add, That Presbyterian Government, being the Primitive Establishment and Government of this Church, they are perswaded it was the Episcopal Party who first left them, and therefore may rather be charged with Schism.

But all comes to this, because the Presbyterians withdraw from, and oppose the Bishops, they are guilty of a dreadful Schism, and therefore our new Episcopal Men, cannot joyn in Worship with the Presbyterians. To which there hath been enough spoken to formerly, and this shewed to be a groundless Assertion, to assert this to be a Schism, and an unjustifiable practice, to separat from publick Worship on that account.

But this leads me to the 2d. Proposition in my Sermon, which our Author undertaketh to Consider, *pag.* 7. of Exam.

And this 2d. Proposition, with which he is displeased, is, that I should say, That the Opinion of these, who maintain such a necessity of Episcopal Ordination, as nullifieth the Ministry, and all the Ordinances dispensed by such who want it, is an Opinion that should not be tolerated in any Protestant Church. On the con-

trary he sayeth pag. 7. That it is a *harmless and very innocent Opinion*, though it destroy the Truth and Being of most of the Reformed Churches, and he accuseth me, as unmerciful to it.

2^{do}. He sayeth, pag. 7. Of my Assertion, (*That such an Opinion should not be tolerated in any Protestant Church*) Now what is this other, than that the Persons who are of such an Opinion, ought not to be allowed to live in a Protestant Countrey, — but every one of them be banished the Kingdom. Anent which I shall say, to use his own words, the unbyassed Reader may Judge, if it was after accurat thinking, that he wrote this. For 1. My words were (*should not be tolerated in any Protestant Church*) And its known that Banishment is not in their power. And the Magistrate may see cause to tolerate that in the Countrey, which the Church cannot tolerate in any of her Communion. 2. Tho Popery be not tolerated, doth it follow, that all Papists are to be banished.

3. I must Complain, That this Author in the same pag. 7. Is pleased to say, that my position as he takes it, must stand on this principle, *That no Persons who maintain opinions which tend to subvert the Authorized and Established Religion of a Countrey, ought to be permitted to live in that Countrey.* And then makes his own Inferences, that this Justifies the Roman Emperours, their persecuting the Primitive Christians, & the French Kings persecuting the Protestants, and would justify the banishing the greater part of the present Clergy, & Church of England, yea, and the Catholick Church out of Christendom, pag. 8. And then in a Jear, he adds, *These are but a specimen of the pleasant Inferences, that may be necessarily drawn from M. M's. position.* Which are but false and groundless aspersions, and the Consequences only of his own Imagined principle, but by no Consequence can be drawn from my position. And I think I need to say no more for Confutation of his assertion, than to set down what I asserted, to wit, *That I think an Opinion so destructive to the Truth and Being of the most of Protestant Churches, should not be tolerated in any Protestant Church.* And then leave it to the Judgement of the Reader, or the Authors own Conscience on 2^d thoughts, whether this must stand on this principle, *That no Persons who maintains Opinions which tend to subvert the Authorized and Established Religion of a Countrey, ought to be permitted to live in that Countrey.* Must the hindering the ruine of

of Reformed Churches, stand on the same principle with the hindering the ruine of *Paganism* and *Poperie*, and the restraint of the one, infer the persecution of the Christian Religion. My position doth not stand on Reformed Churches, their being *established by Law*, but on their being *Reformed Churches of Christ*.

The Author of the Exam. pag. 8. proposeth, to give a plain view of the Opinion, which he alledgeth my position so unmercifully stricks at. But tho he say, pag. 12. *Thus Sir you have such a view, as I had leasure to give you, of the Opinion M. M. is so unmerciful to,* yet he is so far from doing that, that he never essays it, but diverts to another Question, concerning the reasonableness of a Toleration of my allowance, to these who doubt of the validity of Ordinations, that are not Episcopal, of which I may speak afterwards. But it is manifest, that the Opinion I Condemn and Censure is, *the Necessity of Episcopal Ordination*, and the asserting *such a Necessity thereof, as nullifieth the Ministry, and all the Ordinances dispensed by such who want it.* And the Author of the Toleration def. pag. 2. Asserts, *That Episcopacy, is not only necessary to the Well Being, but even to the very Being of a Church.* And the Author of the Exam. shews so much love to this Opinion, that he calls it *a solid principle*, pag. 13. *a Rule founded on Reason, and universally received by the Catholick Church.* Which is said with much confidence, without any shadow of reason, produced for it, or proof that it was universally received by the Catholick Church.

And indeed here are many things to be proven. 1. That Prelacy is of divine Institution, yea, and necessary to the Being of a Church. 2. That there is such a Necessity of Ordination, that in no case there can be a true Ministry without it. 3. That there is such a Necessity, that this be done by Bishops or Prelats, that there can be no true Ministry without it. And if we believe the Author of the Toleration Def. pag. 2. For making them lawfull Pastors, they must 4. be Canonically ordained. and 5. This by an uninterrupted Succession from the Apostles. And the necessity of all these is such, that without them there can be no Ministers, no Sacraments, and no Church, for it is of such a Necessity we speak. And I think there would need clear proofs, to satisfy a tender Conscience, anent the truth of these things, when

it is so evidently manifest, that if these be true, most of the Reformed Churches are no Churches, which the *Papists* greatly desire. I confess I see no proof for such a Necessity of any of these, far less of all of them.

It were enough to me to deny, and to stand on the Defence, and to put the Adversary who affirms to prove it; yet tho I will not digress to the Controversie about Prelacy; the Question now being only about the Necessity, and such a Necessity as above-mentioned, of Ordination by a Prelate Superiour in Office and Order to a Presbyter, and that such a Necessity as nullifies the Ministry, and all the Ordinances dispensed by such who want it, I shall endeavour briefly to shew, 1. That this is the *Papists* engine and Topick, and way of Arguing against Reformed Churches. 2. That it is a Novel opinion taken up by some few of late, contrair to the current opinion of Reformed Divines. 3. That it is hurtful and pernicious in its consequences. And 4. Without Ground.

1. I say, This is the Popish Engine, Topick, and way of Arguing against Reformed Churches. These are the great Prejudices they insist upon, concerning the Call, Ordination and Succession of Ministers, which have been often repeated by them, and refuted by Reformed Divines, see particularly *Voetii Desperata causa Papatus*, and *Glaude Defence of the Reformation*, and Dr. *Field* of the Church, l. 3. c. 39.

2. That this is a Novel opinion taken up by some few of late contrair to the current Opinion of Reformed Divines, is manifest, for not only there is not for ought I know, so much as any one Reformed Divine in any of the Forraign Churches, who was or is for such a Necessity of Episcopal Ordination, but even in the Church of England, where Episcopacy is the Established Government, the most Learned Men, and who have written most zealously in Defence of Episcopacy, do peremptorly deny and oppose such a Necessity of Episcopal Ordination, as nullifies the Ministry of these who want it. I cited on the Margine of my printed Sermon for this, of *Bishops Jewel, Dounham, Bilson, Davenant, Prideaux, Usher*, and Dr. *Field* and *Fern*, and Mr. *Mansons*, &c. and might cite many more, but shall only add the Testimony of the Learned Bishop of *Sarum*, in his Exposition of the 39 Articles of the Church of England, on Article 3. Who page 209, sayeth, *whatever some hotter Spirits have thought*

of this, since that time, yet we are very sure, that not only these who penned the Articles, but the Body of this Church, for above half an Age after, did notwithstanding of those Irregularities, acknowledge the Forraign Churches so constituted, to be true Churches as to all the Essentials of a Church, tho they had been at first irregularly formed, and continued still to be in an Imperfect State. And therefore the general Words in which this part of the Article is framed, seem to have been designed on purpose not to exclude them, and page 260. Neither our Reformers, nor their Successors for near Eighty years after those Articles were published, did ever question the Constitution of such Churches, and Mr. Baxter in 5. Disp. of Church Government saith page 178. this was so common among them; that I do not think a dissenting vote can be found from the first Reformation, till about the preparation for the Spanish match or a little before.

I remember that in the close of my Sermon, when I mentioned this Opinion of the Necessity of Episcopal Ordination, I did in a passing way, touch at some things, which might be a just prejudice against the Opinion of such a Necessity, which the Author of the *Examin.* is pleased to reckon up as five Arguments, and to pretend Answers to them, page 12. 13, 14, 15. And he reckons up this drawn from the Testimony of *English* Divines, as the fourth of my Arguments, and page 14. He takes little notice of these great Men I cited, or their Reasons: But in a slighting way says, 1. *What is this?* but arguing from the private sentiments of some Modern Authors, against a Principle so apparently founded on Scripture and Reason, and so universally received by the Catholick Church for so many Ages, and then addeth, *Let any sober Man judge whether Scale of Ballance hath most of weight in it.* And I shall only say, *Let any Sober Man judge, whether it be more probable, that so many Eminently Learned Men of the Episcopal way, knew better what was founded on Scripture and Reason, and universally received by the Catholick Church, or our Author.* And when we lay their Authority and Reasons in the Ballance, with his bare, tho bold Assertions, which of the Scales hath most Weight in them. And I am so far from believing what he sayeth, that on the contrary I Assert, that his Opinion anent the foresaid Necessity, &c. was so far from being Universally Received; that not one Church, can be allged asserting it *in terminis*, for 15 hundred Years.

But 2. Our Author asks, what if he should produce the Authority of thrise so many Learned Presbyterians, for the Lawfulness of Episcopal Government? And I Answer, That if he do it, when we are Debating that Question, it shall be considered.

3. He asks, *Was there ever a true Son of the Church of England, who would not have condemned Schismatical Ordination?* I Answer, They could have Judged them Uncanonical, but not wholly nullified them, and the Ordinances dispensed by them, which may serve for Answer to the first.

As to what the Church of *England* did as to Re-ordination, anno 1660, That was by a New peculiar Statute for that Nation and Church; for any that should be capable of any Benefite therein, but not from the Principle of Nullifying the Ministry of these who want it, as is manifest by what he said.

And that this is a new Opinion in the Church of *Scotland*, even among the Episcopal men of this Nation (which the Author page 13. sets down as my 2^d Argument) our Author cannot deny the Truth of what I assert. But after some Retortion of our Receding, not only from the Opinions of our *Reformers*, but from the Opinions of our own *Predecessors*, before the year 1662, (which is false) he addeth page 13. *Such Arguings from the Authority of our Predecessors for two or three Generation, have far more of Romish Leaven in them, than the most ancient Opinion of the Necessity of Episcopal Ordinations;* But as this is not an Ancient, far less a most Ancient Opinion, so that it is part of the *Romish Leaven* is formerly shewed: But that the usual way of citing of Testimonies from our *Predecessors*, is a part of the *Romish Leaven*, is an odd Assertion, to give no worse Character of it.

As for his Retortions, they signify nothing, unless we were handling the Controversies anent the Particulars instanced, and diverse of them have been already spoke to, as anent the reading of Scriptures, &c. And it were easie to shew, as others of them were, that our *Reformers* contended against Prelacy, and the civil places and Offices of Church-men, and sitting and Voting in Parliament, But I will not now digress to these things.

But there are two things which evidence the Novelty of this Opinion in *Scotland*. The first is, that Bishop *Spotswood* in his History of the Church of *Scotland*, sheweth that the *Scots Ministers* (of whom

whom he was one himself) when to be consecrated Bishops in England, anno 1610, would not yield to be Re-ordained, because they believed the Ordination they had by Presbyters was valid.

The 2d is, that tho these who were consecrated Bishops, Anno 1662, submitted to Re-ordination, for which I know they were condemned and blamed, by many of the Episcopal perswasion in Scotland at that time: Yet these who conformed to Prelacy at that time, were not obliged to, nor did they submit to Re-ordination, being perswaded their former Ordination was valid.

Our Author taketh notice, page 13. of this as the third of my Arguments as he calleth them, for that then, I said this Opinion would Nullifie the Ordination of these who conformed to Prelacy, anno 1662. To this he Answers, 1. *This is again to make Practice the Standard of Principle ;* To which I Answer, that it is but to improve an absurd consequence, following on that pretended Principle ; as a just prejudice against the Truth of it. 2. He Answers, *that there is a notable difference, betwixt the case of the present Presbyterians, and these who conformed anno 1662. These having returned to a due subordination, and subjection to their Bishops, and thereupon had full allowance from their Bishops, to exercise the power of Presbyters. And such allowance I will hold to be equivalent to Episcopal Ordination, till M. M. shall prove that it's not.* To which I Reply, 1. I am not comparing the case of Presbyterians, and these who Conformed 1662. together; but Arguing from a hurtful consequence, in nullifying the Ministry of these whom it's like, he will more regard. And 2. Bringing a proof that this can not be the Opinion of these who were Episcopal in this Nation. Anno 1662. 3. I am not concerned to prove that the Bishops allowance is not equivalent to Ordination, but the Author who asserts it, is obliged to prove it, which perhaps he may find difficult, if he essay to bring his proof from Scripture, or Reason. 4. Tho it were granted, That the Bishops allowance after their subjection to him, should give them power as Ministers, and to exercise the Office of Presbyters, yet what doth he say, of the time of their Ministry before their subjection to the Bishop. Will he have the Bishops allowance 62. to be sufficient to make their Ministry valid in its exercise, for may be 20. years before *jure accrescendi*. And as this is a New Opinion in this Church,

So I hope it is not the General Opinion of these of the Episcopal persuasion in this Nation, at this present time, yea I find it not the Opinion of the Author of the case of the Clergy, &c. N. See p. 15. the 2d. Edition. Thus it is made manifest, this is a Novel Opinion taken up by some few of late, whom the Bishop of Sarum, calls hotter Spirits, contrary to the current opinion of Reformed Divines.

The 3d thing proposed, was to shew, That this Opinion is pernicious in it's Fruits and Consequences. This was hinted at in the Sermon, page 14. That this Opinion is destructive to the Truth, and Being of the most of Protestant Churches, and this Author, in page 12. of Examin. Takes Notice of it, as the first of these he calls my five Arguments. And for Answer, says, *If M. M. base pleasure, be may consider, that this is a pretty odd way of reasoning.* But I think a little leisure may discover, that to argue as absurd it is, not an odd way of reasoning, but usual among all Schollars, for the Argument might run thus, If this Opinion were true, and allowed, it will necessarily infer the destruction of the Truth and Being of the most of Reformed Churches, but that were absurd, therefore the Opinion from which it follows must be false; or thus, that Opinion which is so dangerous and hurtful, as to be destructive of the Truth and Being of the most of Reformed Churches should not be tolerated in any protestant Church, but such an Opinion as asserts the Necessity of Episcopal Ordination is so dangerous and destructive to the Truth and Being of Reformed Churches, and therefore is not to be tolerated; And his Answer hereto is, *I confess, odd from a protest Protestant, being on the matter plainly this, that its no absurdity to ruine and destroy the truth & Being of the Reformed Church, and to deny them to be Churches of Christ, and this he doth with much disdain, what (sayeth he) must we thro up a solid principle, because such or such a Churches Constitution is not consistent with it,* and he says, *this is to make Practice the Standard of Principle, &c.* But I thought when the Question was, whether such a Position was a principle, the representing of such wofull Consequence necessarily following upon it, might been a just prejudice against it, and called for more serious thoughts, before there had been so confident asserting, *That this is a Rule founded on so much Reason, and so universally*

versally received by the Catholick Church for so many Ages. The contrair of which is manifest by what hath been said.

But so confident is our Author, that he adds page 13. M. 14. *May with as good reason say, that we ought to return to Rome, because he that condemns the Romish Communion, condemns so great a part of Christendom,* to which I shall give no other Reply, than to leave it to the unbyassed Reader, whether by this way of Reasoning, its no greater absurdity to destroy the Truth and Being of the most of Reformed Churches, than to condemn the *Romish Communion*, which is so great a part of Christendom.

And now to use our Authors own Words, if or *when he can get leisure*, I wish he may seriously consider, how hurtful and pernicious an Opinion this is. *However ineffective* (he sayeth page 7.) *it hath been in Scotland hitherto*, because it hath not been vented before, yet what hurt it may now do, when vented, God knoweth, Sure by this, he, and these of his Opinion, do great Service to the *Papists*, while they proclaim that their *Romish Church* is a true Church, their Priests true Priests, and their Ordinances and Administrations valid, but all the Protestant Churches that are not Prelatical, are indeed no Churches, and their Ministers no Ministers, &c. How could ye gratifie *Papists* more.

Yea this is the way to harden the wicked, and make them cast off the publick Worship, yea to turn Seekers or Infidels, and to deny all Churches and Ministry in the world, their being few that have not greater blemishes, and defects than this.

Yea, this is to prefer a Formality, a Circumstance, or Mode to the being of Churches or Ministry, and the substance of Worship, and the salvation of Mens Souls: as if it were better for Churches to be no Churches, than not Prelatical: or for Souls to be Condemned, than to be saved by Men that are not Prelatical! is not this to plead the very Cause of Satan, by accusing so many famous Churches, and Ministers? as being none indeed? and drawing the People so to censure them, and forsake them.

I proceed now to the fourth thing proposed, that this so cruel and uncharitable an opinion, *Of such a necessity of Episcopal Ordination, as nullifies the Ministry and all the Ordinances dispenced by such who want it,* However boldly and confidently delivered as a solid principle, and
a Rule

a Rule founded on Reason, and universally received by the Catholick Church, yet hath no Ground from Scripture or Reason, nor was it ever universally received by the Church.

And we are perswaded of this, 1. For that there is no Ground from Scripture, for the Divine Institutions of Prelates and Prelacy, and Order and Office of Men, distinct from and superior to Presbyters, having Authority above them, and the power of Ordination and Jurisdiction, to be continued in the Church.

I will not digress to the controversy about Prelacy, and the Original and Institution thereof, but shall only say this, That while we find in Scripture that Bishops and Presbyters have the same common Names, the same Qualifications required, the same Work and Duty enjoined, we cannot believe them to be distinct Orders and Offices of Men, to be continued in the Church. And how inconsistent the Arguments from the Old Testament, and the order of Priests, or the Apostles Office in the New Testament, or the Instances of *Timothy* and *Titus*, and the Angels of the seven Churches are, hath been often evidenced, and briefly the very clearly and solidly, by the Author of the Remarks on the Case, &c.

Nor will I enter the Debate anent the Antiquity of Prelacy, for I readily yield there hath been a very ancient Use of some kind of Episcopacy in the Church, tho' far different from what it hath been in after-times: But as it hath not been so from the Beginning, so it will not easily be proved, that our Modern Prelacy was of Universal Use at all times, and in all places of the Church: Or that in any Age, but less that for Fifteen Hundred Years it was believed and received Universally, that the Superiority of the Bishops above Presbyters, was of Divine Institution, as a distinct Order and Office of the Church.

But I will not digress to this Debate, it is not Institution, but the Necessity, and such a Necessity as nullifies the Churches and Ministry and Ordinances of them who want it, about which our present Question is. Now tho' Episcopacy were, as they call it, a Divine or Apostolical Institution, (which we deny) yet it doth not follow, that there is such a Necessity of Episcopacy, or of Episcopal Ordination. For a thing may be of Divine Institution, and yet not of such absolute Necessity; Divines do distinguish betwixt the Necessity of Precept, &c. of Men, the exercise of publick Worship is a Duty, but not always

in case of persecution, *Hof. 6. 6.* The Learned Doctor *John Forbes* in his *Irenicum lib. 2. chap. 11. page 159.* Though he say, *Gradu quem Episcopalis est juris divini, &c.* yet he saith contrary to the Author of *Toleration Defended*, That this Oeconomy is not necessary to the being of a Church. For which he brings Arguments from *Acts 8. 12. and chap. 11, 20, 22. and Acts 14. 20, 21, 22. and Acts 20.* And he proveth out of *John Major lib. 2. Hist. De Gestis Scotorum*, That the Scots were a Christian Church without Bishops for two Hundred and Thirty Years, and page 160. He proves the same from the Instance of the Roman Church, after the death of *Xistus* the 2d. And he proveth, that every defect of that, which is prescribed by Divine Right, is not essential, taking away the Essence of the Church. As he instanteth in *Deacons*, for lifetime separated by Ordination, wanting among us, for the poverty of the Church; So in some Reformed Churches the civil Magistrat impedes the having of Bishops. These (saith he) are Oeconomical defects, as to good Order, but not essential, so as to take away the Being or Power of a true Church. And the Author of the Case seemeth to be of the same mind, page 13, of the 2d. Edition, as was noted before.

But neither is the Question only about the necessity of Prelats or Prelacy, but about the necessity of Ordination by a Prelate, perhaps it will be found difficult to prove the indispensable necessity of Ordination in General (though it should be used when it can be had) it being but the manner and solemn way of Investiture with the Office. But to prove the Necessity not only of Ordination, but that it must be by a Prelate, Superior in Office and Order to a Presbyter, and that so necessary as that it nullifies the Ministry, and all the Ordinances dispensed by such who want it, will be found a more difficult and impossible work: And here our Author joyneth with the Popish Writers, in the assertion against the call of the Pastors of Reformed Churches; and useth the same Arguments; See *Jansen. in Voet. deff. causa papae*. And *Dr. Field of the Church, lib. 3d. chap. 39.*

It were enough for me to deny, and to stand on the Defence and put the Adversary who affirms to prove it. But many Learned Men have not only denied such a Necessity, but do positively prove the Right of Presbyters to ordain, & the validity of Ordination by Presbyters, and that Bishops have this power only as Presbyters: See *1 Tim. 4. 14.* The Ordination of *Timothy* made by laying on of the

hands of the Presbytry, which cannot, saith Doctor Forbes page 161. be understood of the Office which hath no Hands, and to understand it of a Meeting of Bishops, saith the same Author, unless you thereby understand simple Presbyters, *were a violent Interpretation, and an unusual Sense.* It is not said laying on of the hands of the Prelate or Prelacy, but of the Presbytry, so that Presbyters have an Intrinsic Right and Power of Ordaining, as well as of Preaching and Baptising, tho' the one may be done by one personally and alone, but the other is to be done in a Collegiat Way, with the concurrence of others; And any restraint of Presbyters Intrinsic Power and Authority to ordain Ministers, was from Ecclesiastical Canons, but from the Canons of the Church, see F. Mission, in Defence of the Ordination of the Ministers of the Reformed Churches. As divers other things were prohibited by Canons, and these Canons made by Bishops enlarging their Power, but they came not to this height at first. And as Presbyters were forbidden by the Canons, to ordain without the Bishop, so were Bishops forbidden to ordain, without Presbyters, and all the Presbyters present, were ordained to lay on hands upon the Person ordained, which was not only as Consenting, but as Ordaining, and using the Mean of obtaining the Charisma, or Gift, for the People by their Suffrage and Prayers consent, but do not lay on hands, this agrees only to them who by Office have Power to Bless and Ordain. Ordinatio is Ordinis, so that the Right to Ordain cannot be taken away by Humane Rules, or Ecclesiastical Prohibition.

And 2. This may be done by Presbyters where there is no Bishop, as the forecited Doctor Forbes proves from Ambrose in Epist. ad Eph. chap. 4. And Augustine, or whoever is the Author of the Questions from both Testaments, Quest. 101. and from the Chor Episcopi, of which see at length from page 165 to 175. proving them to be but Presbyters. So doth Doctor Field.

Yea 3. That a Presbyter hath not only concurred in the Ordination of a Bishop, as in the Case of Pelagius the first of Rome, but also without a Bishop, making an Episcopus Preses from among themselves, as he proves out of Jerom in his Ep. to Evagrius concerning the Presbyters of Alexandria, and that for a long time. And the same was the Opinion of the Famous, Pious, and Learned Doctor Usher Primate of Armagh, as is evident by the account of his Judgement set forth by Doctor Bernard; And Mr. Baxter reports that Doctor Usher told him, That when King Charles the first did ask of him, for an Instance of any Ordination in the Primitive Church performed by Presbyters alone, he gave this of Alexandria.

The same Doctor Forbes proveth the Validity of Ordination by Presbyters alone, by the Testimonies of Schoolmen, both Divines and Canonists. from page 175 to page 179, and page 178, hath these words, *Ex his evidenter sequitur, &c. From these things it evidently follows that the Ordination which is performed by Presbyters alone, is not invalid by Divine Right, nor is Ordination by Divine Right, so proper to Bishops, that it cannot be validly performed by Presbyters only.* And page 180, he hath these words, *At vero falsum est, &c. But it is false, and said without ground, nor can it be proven, that Christ hath determined, that Bishops only should be Ministers of the Greater or Superior Order.* And the Learned Doctor Field lib. 3d. ch. 39. and lib. 5. ch. 29. and ch. 56. asserteth the same, and useth the like Arguments and Proofs.

4. It were easie to shew, both from the Episcopal Divines, and Popish Schoolmen, Divines, and Canonists, that Bishops and Presbyters are not distinct Orders and Officers, but a Degree for Order and Peace. Yea, that Bishops ordain as Presbyters,

byters: and that if not Presbyters they could not ordain. I shall for this transcribe the words of the Learned Doctor Field, lib. 3. ch. 39. of the Church, page 136, who asserts, *That it will appear to all men who enter into the due consideration thereof, that the Power of Order is the same in all the Fatherly Guides of GOD's Church, and that it is only for Order sake, and the preservation of Peace, that there is a Limitation of the Use and Exercise thereof.* And then addeth, *Hereunto agree all the best Learned of the Romanists themselves, freely confessing that that wherein a Bishop excelleth Presbyters, is not a distinct and higher Order or Power of Order, but a kind of Dignity, Office, or Implyment only.* And he sheweth how they prove it, for that a Bishop ordained *per saltum*, i. e. who has not been ordained a Presbyter, can neither administrate the Eucharist, nor ordain Presbyters, because he is not one himself. And then page 137. he saith, *It is most manifest, That that wherein a Bishop excelleth a Presbyter, is not a distinct Power of Order, but an Eminency and Dignity on'y, specially yielded to one above rest of the same Rank, for Order sake, and to preserve the Peace and Unity of the Church.* Hence it followeth that there are many things, which in some Cases Presbyters may lawfully do, which are peculiarly reserved to Bishops, as *Jerom contra Iovinianum*, saith, rather for the honour of the Ministry than the Necessity of any Law. And afterward Doctor Field addeth, *There is no Reason to be given, but that in Case of Necessity — But that Presbyters as they may do all other Acts, whatsoever, Special challenge Bishops in ordinary course may make unto them, might do this also. Who then dare condemn all these worthy Ministers of GOD that were ordained by Presbyters in sundry Churches of the World.* And addeth — *Surely the best Learned in the Church of Rome in former times, durst not pronounce all Ordinations of this nature to be void.* And then saith for this *Armenianus* and *Alex. Hales*, and argueth from the *Chor. Episcopi*.

And page 138. As to what may be alledged out of the Fathers for making all such Ordinations Void and Null. He saith, 1. *It is to be understood, according to the Drift of the Council in use in their time, and not absolutely in the nature of the thing, which he sheweth by instances in divers other things.* And then addeth 2. *Their sayings are to be understood regularly, not without exception of some special Cases, which may follow.* And lib. 3. chap. 36. page 703. and 704. He saith, *Presbyters are equal to the Bishop in the Power of Order and Ministry — And that they cannot Ordain without the Bishop, is not because the Power of Order which is given in Ordination, is less in them than in Bishops.* This he proveth out of *Armenianus*, *Hales*, and *Durand*. See to the same purpose, *Pet. Forbes* Bishop of Aberdeen, *De consecratione Ministrorum*, as Appendix to his *Commentarius in Revel. in Latine*, page 283, See.

But let us hear now, what Grounds our Author can produce for this his Position, which hath such Consequences, and is opposed by so many Learned Men of the Episcopal Persuasion. On this he spends 4. pages, to wit. page 9. 10, 11, 12.

I acknowledge what he saith paragraph first, that Ministers should have their Commission from God, as also what he saith paragraph 2d. That God both now and ordinarily give Immediat Commissions, but mediately, and by the ways and means of his Appointment.

But when page 10. paragraph 3. he saith, That these of the Episcopal Persuasion think they have very great reason to believe, *That Bishops are the men, whom God hath so empowered to give Commission to Men to be Governors of his Church, and that no valid Commission can be Regularly and Orderly given without them. Bishops are the Persons who have the chief power of granting such Commissions.* I do first observe,

he changes the Question from the necessity, as the Regular validity of Ordination, as
 as was marked before, it is one thing to say, that it is according to Church-Councils,
 and another to say, that it is of Divine Institution, and one thing to be of pos-
 itive Institution, and another thing to be of absolute Necessity, so that want of it
 doth nullifie the Ministry. And if the proof reach not this, they prove not the
 Conclusion in debate. And that they do not this, is evident to any Reader;
 besides, that the proof is, but they think this, and they think that, and others may say,
 they think the contrary, upon better Reasons, and they may, while the Author hath
 confidence to say, That they have every whit as good evidence for believing Episcopal Go-
 vernment to be of Apostolick Institution, as they have for such a Gospel, or such an Epistle,
 being part of the Sacred Canon; And I deny, That in all the New Testament he can
 produce one Instance, of an Ordination performed by Bishops in a proper sense, (to use
 his own words) nor that Timothy and Titus were such, and tho' he had the Pra-
 ctice and Canons of the Church for full 15. Ages for Bishops, they being the
 chief Ordainers, which he cannot prove, I am sure of the first of the 15. Yet it
 doth not prove what he undertook, of the Necessity of Episcopal Ordination, and
 therefore I pursue it no more.

Page 11. Parag. 4. He sayeth, the power of a Presbyter is easily di-
 stinguishable from a power to ordain Presbyters, and they think it plain,
 that one may have the power of a Presbyter without having a
 power to ordain Presbyters, And he thinks that these powers so se-
 parable in their natures, were always actually separated.
 In all which discourse he supposeth, what will not be granted, yea,
 that which really is the thing controverted betwixt him and us, and
 which is denied by us, to wit, That the Presbyters power is only a
 power to preach and administrat the Sacraments, now we say this is
 but a part of his power, and that he hath also power to ordain other
 Presbyters. And his similitudes here do not quadrat, for it is not
 pretended, that it is in the power of the Sheriff, to ordain other
 Sheriffs.

He addeth page 11. ' This is certain, these who at the Reforma-
 ' tion, were only simple Presbyters, got no more than the power of
 ' simple Presbyters: and if they got no more, they could exercise
 ' no more. How could they ordain Presbyters, if they got not the
 ' power of ordaining Presbyters. This is the very Popish Argu-
 ment against the Call of our Reformers. But of no weight, for we
 say, the power of ordaining is one part of the Presbyters power, and
 that by divine Institution, 1 Tim. 4. 14. And what is so conjoyn-
 ed, cannot be separat by men.

But he sayeth, this will not help the matter, to say so. For men may
 so sever the from divine Institution, as to confer the one without the other,
 and those who receives but the one, cannot exercise the other.
 Answ.

Ans. 1. If the power of the Presbyter includes the power of Ordaining, as I have oft told them, we believe it doth, then the Ordainers cannot confer the power of a Presbyter, without the power of Ordaining. 2. What God hath conjoyned, none can separat, neither can the Intention of Ordainers, mutilate the Office, or power which GOD hath annexed to it, and tho he who ordaineth a Presbyter, should intend only to confer the power of Preaching and ministrating the Sacraments, and that they should have no power to Ordain, his Intention cannot hinder from that power, and as the learned Dr, *Forbes* sheweth, page 189. ' That it is the common Opinion of Divines, and Canonists, that these things which agree to a Bishop, or Presbyter *vi ordinis* by vertue of the Order, cannot be taken away by any Church Prohibition. And as the Administrators Intention, can not hinder the effect of a Sacrament, neither can it hinder the effect of Ordination, tho it be no Sacrament.

As for his Principle mentioned paragraph 6. That no man can exercise an Ecclesiastical power, which he hath not received from God, either immediatly or mediately. I Ans. The Person ordained hath this power from God mediately, by vertue of his Commission to Presbyters in the Scripture, tho the ordainer in his Intention perversly divide the power and parts of the Office of a Presbyter. And here its worth the marking, That our Author hath another paradoxal principle, that the Ordainer may, by his Intentions so divide, what God hath conjoyned, that though the outward part of Ordination be used, it shall have its effect according to his Intention in the one, and have no effect as to the other, because of his want of Intent to confer it. Which is very like a piece of Popery, as I conceive.

In paragraph 7. Our Author sayeth, *These of the Episcopal perswasion, (not all, but the high flown Men of this new set) are the more encouraged to adhere to this their Opinion, when they consider how they must be extremely at a loss in matters of such consequence, when their Scheme about deriving valid Orders is laid aside, from what hand said he can valid Ordination be had, who can confer them?*

He needed not stayed Arguing against Ordination, by the Magistrat or People, for it is not affected by us, Tho it will not be easie to prove, that the Election of the People with the Magistrates consent, may not evidence a mans Mission in a case of Necessity, without Prelatical Ordination. But I say, there may be, and hath been lawfull and valid Ordination, by Presbyters, without a Prelat. And tho he pass this, with saying, we have already seen how little reason there is to think that simple Presbyters can Ordain, we on the contrair say, it may appear, by what is above said, there is good reason for it, and none against it.

As for his Accusation, page 12. of the Presbyterian Ordinations in Scotland, as schismatical, its answered already, page 19. 11. And tho in a big word, he say, They cannot confer the power of Ordination, yet they confer the power of Ordination. They

They have more than Ground enough to condemn them as such, yet he produceth none but his own bare word for it.

Yea, and tho we were *Schismatical*, he would remember that he granted, that Ordination of such may be valid, page 8. And we speak not now of *Communion*, for of that formerly, but of *Ordination and the necessity of Episcopal Ordination*.

And these are all the Grounds our Author produces, for this his assertion, of such a Necessity of Episcopal Ordination, which I have shewed to be Novel, and without ground, and of pernicious Consequence.

And if men would use but a little Reflection, they might discern, how by Concession, and their own practice, that which is of the greatest Consequence in the Mission of Ministers, to wit, The trying of their Gifts, and judging them to be qualified as these whom God sends, is wholly laid over upon the Presbyters. And they joyn also in the ritual part of Imposition of hands.

And I hope it will not be judged Enthusiastical, but a Scriptural Argument, by sober and serious and considering Persons, that there are many serious Christians, who have a Witness in themselves, anent Presbyterian Ministers, there being Ministers of Christ, so that they may say, as 2 Cor. 3. *beg. Need we Epistles of Commendation, ye are our Epistle*, &c. I shall conclude this Debate, anent the Necessity of Episcopal Ordination, with the words of the Learned Mr. *Claud*, in his Defence of the Reformation, Part 4. pag. 97. Which are these. *And to speak my own thoughts freely, it seems to me, that that firm Opinion of the absolute necessity of Episcopacy, that goes so high as to own no Church, or Call, or Ministry, or Sacraments, or Salvation in the World, where there are no Episcopal Ordinations, although there should be the true Faith, the true Doctrine and Piety there, and which would that all Religion should depend on a Formality, and even on a Formality, that we have shown to be of no other than humane Institution, that Opinion, I say, can not be looked on otherwise, than as the very worst Character, and mark of the highest Hypocrisy, a piece of Pharisaism throughout, that strains at a Gnat, when it swallows a Camel, and I cannot avoid having at least a Contempt of those kind of thoughts, and a Compassion for those who fill their heads with them.*

Having Vindicated my SERMON from the Examiner, I shall not detain the Reader with a long Reply to the Author of the *Tol. Defen.* He so misrepresents Words and Things, that some have thought, that there needed no other Answer than a Remit to his own Conscience, if he would allow it a free Reflection. I do truly pity him, and am very Sorry for him, for he has wronged both his Reputation and Conscience, by Asserting so many evident Falsehoods, which I Pray may be forgiven him.

For 1. It is a manifest Falsehood with which he begins his Observes on my Sermon, page 19. *viz. That I take it for granted, That by the Church, the Temple and Jerusalem, we are only to understand the Presbyterian Government and Party, and by Consequence, that all others of different Perswasions, whether Protestant or Popish, are all out of the Church, and no better than Heathens and Pagans.* Here (sayeth he) You have one touch of his Charity. And I say, you have here an Evidence of this Mans Veracity, for there is not in all this one Word of Truth, and I never Said or Thought so, I think the Presbyterian a part of the Church, not the whole, or only they.

2. He sayeth in the same page, *that I avouch my self to be the Servant of a great Master, and yet am somewhat diffident concerning my Warrant, and even whether what I delivered, should be found agreeable to the Word of GOD, which is another Falsehood.* And all the Ground.

(30)

Ground he produceth for it is, in these Words, (*As may appear by his, if I have a Warrant, and I hope I shall deliver nothing but, &c.*) and there needeth no more, but the reading the intire Sentence, to convince the Contrair.

1. Page 20. Is a Bundle of Falsehoods, such as, *That the Presbyterians thanked GOD that the Papists and they were embarked in the same bottom against the Episcopal Church.* 2. *That none of them save Mr. Hardie did so much as open their Mouths to Preach against publick Blasphemy, or the Growth of Popery.* 3. *That Presbyterians did Deny against such of the Bishops and their Clergy as were not for the Toleration or the Abrogation of the Penal Statutes.* 4. *That some Presbyterians had the Impudence, publicly in Discourse to avow that the Seven English Bishops did well deserve to be Hung, Drawn and Quartered upon that Account; All which I hold to be False-hoods, till he bring sufficient proofs of their Truth; and tho he should prove that some said or did so, it were not so good Ground to Conclude it against all Presbyterians, as the plurality of the Scots Bishops being for the abrogation of the Penal Statutes, were to conclude, that the Episcopal Church was so, these being the Representatives of it.*

4. It's a Falsehood, which he sayeth, *That I subscribed Canonical obedience to the Bishop of Aberdeen the 15. of January 1663.* The Falsehood of which, and account of what I subscribed, I gave in Answer to a like Accusation in the Year, 1690: and for my Vindication refer thereto.

5. He falsely accuses me, pag. 24. for transgressing the Rules of Morality, in the 25. pag. of my SERMON, and that under the covert of some words taken out of Scripture, which yet, sayeth he are none of Gods words, but those of a Heathen King, I fall down right Cursing and Banning, all that design a Toleration, or any abatement of *Prophanity, &c.* I need no more to convince of the Falsehood of this than to recommend to you the reading of what I said, pag. 14. & 19. of the Sermon, where I cite these Words out of *Ezra. 6. 6. 7. 23.* and *Chap. 7. 33.* Which tho they be the Words of a Heathen King, yet *Lev. Chap. 24. 17.* Blesseth God for putting that into the heart of the King. I do not regard his Sarcastical Jest of Juno's threatnings, but I pray God convince him of, and forgive unto him, the Malice, and ill Nature which appears in the Gloss he puts on my citing *Ezra. 6. 23. 14.* But the most of this *Anonymous Pamphlet*, in so far as concerneth me, being Railing and Buffoonry, I shall not answer it, with *Judg. 9. 9.* — The Lord rebuke thee. But with *Luke 23. 9. 34.* Father forgive them, for they know not what they do.

6 MA 50

F I N I S.

41 a
but

GOD

1.

black

paper

4.

even

All

with;

d to

with

before

Di-

as of

690:

the

crip-

fall

from

and

cite

the

that

na t

Ma-

er 4

65-

The

they